

UTTG-27-92

November 1992

Black hole formation in $c = 1$ String Field Theory[★]JORGE G. RUSSO,[†]

*Theory Group, Department of Physics, University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712*

ABSTRACT

A suggestion on how black holes may appear in Das-Jevicki Collective field theory is given. We study the behaviour of a ‘test’ particle when energy is sent into the system. A perturbation moving near the potential barrier can create a large-distance black hole geometry where the seeming curvature singularity is at the position of the barrier. In the simplest ‘static’ case the exact $D = 2$ black hole metric emerges.

★ Work supported in part by NSF grant PHY 9009850 and R. A. Welch Foundation.

† e-mail: russo@utaphy.ph.utexas.edu

The double scaling continuum limit of the $c = 1$ matrix model [1-12] is expected to describe critical strings moving in two space-time dimensions (see e.g. refs. [3, 13]). Since the discovery of a black hole background in this continuum two-dimensional theory [14-16] there have been a number of attempts to find the counterpart in the matrix model formulation [17-19][‡].

In the last two years there was considerable progress in understanding another $D = 2$ string background, the Liouville theory coupled to one scalar matter field [7, 11, 20-23]. In particular, this continuum theory was shown to have the same w_∞ symmetry that appears in the $c = 1$ matrix model [9-12, 23], and a good agreement between the tree-level S-matrices was found (see e.g. refs. [20, 21]).

The matrix model is equivalent to a $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional field theory where the collective field is the density of eigenvalues of the matrix [2]. This theory is expected to be the field theory of the only propagating mode of $D = 2$ string theory, where there are no transversal excitations. At classical level, one expects a relation with the string effective action after all other modes of the spectrum have been gauged away or integrated out by the equations of motion. The absence of a metric in a resulting field theory obscures the geometrical interpretation of physical processes.

To get a rough idea of what are the signs which would indicate the presence of a black hole in the DJ field theory, it is instructive to perform the integration of metric and dilaton in the $D = 2$ string theory, even if this will be done only in a very approximative way.

To leading α' order, the tree-level string effective action for the metric, dilaton and tachyon is given by,

$$S = \int d^2x \sqrt{-G} \left[e^{-2\phi} (R + 4\partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi + c) - \partial_\mu \eta \partial^\mu \eta - (\partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - \nabla^2 \phi + \frac{2}{\alpha'}) \eta^2 + O(\eta^3) \right], \quad (1)$$

where η is related to the usual tachyon by $\eta = \exp(-\phi)T$, and $c = -8/\alpha'$.

In the conformal gauge $G_{\mu\nu} = e^{2\rho} \eta_{\mu\nu}$ ($\eta_{00} = -\eta_{11} = 1$), the equations of motion take the form

$$\partial_+ \partial_- (\rho - \phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_+ (e^\phi \eta) \partial_- (e^\phi \eta) \quad , \quad (2)$$

$$4\partial_+ \partial_- e^{-2\phi} = c e^{2\rho - 2\phi} - \frac{2}{\alpha'} e^{2\rho} \eta^2 \quad , \quad (3)$$

[‡] The present approach is different from other interesting, alternative proposals (see refs. [17, 19]).

$$\partial_{\pm}^2 \phi - 2\partial_{\pm} \rho \partial_{\pm} \phi = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\pm} (e^{\phi} \eta) \partial_{\pm} (e^{\phi} \eta) \quad , \quad (4)$$

$$\partial_+ \partial_- \eta = (\partial_+ \phi \partial_- \phi - \partial_+ \partial_- \phi + \frac{1}{2\alpha'} e^{2\rho}) \eta^2 + O(\eta^3) \quad . \quad (5)$$

Ignoring the η back reaction the general solution to eqs.(2)-(4) is the black hole background discussed in refs.[14- 16]. Inserting this background into eq. (5) one can see that η becomes massless far away. By making perturbation theory around the linear dilaton background, the η dependence in eqs.(2), (3) can be neglected in the first order approximation. So let us assume that far away we have $\partial_+ \partial_- (\rho - \phi) \sim 0$ and hence we can fix the ‘‘Kruskal’’ gauge $\rho \sim \phi$. Then eq. (3) becomes, $4\partial_+ \partial_- e^{-2\phi} \sim c$, i.e. $e^{-2\phi} = \frac{c}{4} x^+ x^- + h_+(x^+) + h_-(x^-)$. The leading piece of the constraint equations (4) takes the form (we assume $\partial_{\pm} \eta \gg \eta \partial_{\pm} \phi \sim -\eta/2x^{\pm}$ for $x^{\pm} \rightarrow \pm\infty$)

$$\partial_{\pm}^2 e^{-2\phi} \sim -\partial_{\pm} \eta \partial_{\pm} \eta \quad .$$

Therefore $h_{\pm}'' \sim -\partial_{\pm} \eta \partial_{\pm} \eta$, or

$$h_{\pm}(x^{\pm}) \sim - \int \int \partial_{\pm} \eta \partial_{\pm} \eta \quad . \quad (6)$$

Inserting these solutions for ρ and ϕ into eq. (5), what remains is a nonlinear integro-differential equation expressed purely in terms of η . From this equation one can obtain scattering amplitudes corresponding to this scalar field effective theory.

To see gravitational collapse we imagine that an energetic wave η_0 , $\partial_+ \partial_- \eta_0 \sim 0$ is sent in, expand $\eta = \eta_0 + \varepsilon$, and study the behaviour of the small fluctuation or ‘test’ particle ε in the incoming background η_0 . Then the conformal factor and dilaton become $e^{-2\rho} = e^{-2\phi} = \frac{c}{4} x^+ x^- + h_+(\partial_+ \eta_0) + h_-(\partial_- \eta_0) + O(\varepsilon)$, which for a large class of η_0 represents a black hole. Then eq. (5) takes the form

$$\partial_+ \partial_- \varepsilon = m(\eta_0) \varepsilon + j(\eta_0) + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad , \quad (7)$$

where both $m, j \rightarrow 0$ asymptotically. The black hole geometry has to be read out of $m(\eta_0)$ in eq.(7), since in the conformal gauge it does not show up in the Laplacian. However, by repeating the above procedure, e.g., in the linear dilaton gauge $\phi = -x$ one finds a Laplacian of the form $f^{-1} \partial_t^2 \varepsilon - f \partial_x^2 \varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$, $f \equiv 1 - M(\eta_0) e^{-2x}$, where the underlying large-distance geometry is exhibited in a manifest way.

The bosonic hamiltonian for the double scaled $c = 1$ matrix model is given by [2] (we follow the notation of ref.[7])

$$H = \int dx \left(\frac{g_s^2}{2} \Pi_\zeta (\partial_x \zeta) \Pi_\zeta + \frac{\pi^2}{6g_s^2} (\partial_x \zeta)^3 + \frac{1}{2g_s^2} (1 - x^2) (\partial_x \zeta) \right) , \quad (8)$$

where x denotes the (rescaled) space of eigenvalues of the original matrix model, $\Pi_\zeta(x)$ is the momentum conjugate to $\zeta(x)$. The equations of motion which follow from the above hamiltonian are

$$\partial_t \zeta = g_s^2 \Pi_\zeta \partial_x \zeta , \quad \partial_t \Pi_\zeta = \frac{g_s^2}{2} \partial_x \Pi_\zeta^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{2g_s^2} \partial_x (\partial_x \zeta)^2 - \frac{1}{g_s^2} x . \quad (9)$$

The general solution to these equations is [7]

$$\Pi_\zeta = -\frac{p_+ + p_-}{2g_s^2} , \quad \partial_x \zeta = \frac{p_+ - p_-}{2\pi} , \quad (10)$$

where $p_\pm(x, t) = a(\sigma_\pm) \sinh(t - \sigma_\pm)$, $a(\sigma)$ is an arbitrary function of σ and $\sigma_\pm = \sigma_\pm(x, t)$ are the two solutions of $x = a(\sigma) \cosh(t - \sigma)$.

The momenta $p_\pm$ obey the transport equation

$$\partial_t p_\pm = x - p_\pm \partial_x p_\pm . \quad (11)$$

The ground state is given by the static solution

$$\Pi_\zeta = 0 , \quad \partial_x \zeta_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} (x^2 - 1)^{1/2} , \quad |x| > 1 . \quad (12)$$

Now we introduce the scalar field Ψ and its momentum conjugate Π as

$$\zeta = \zeta_0(x) + \frac{g_s}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Psi , \quad \Pi_\zeta = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{g_s} \Pi . \quad (13)$$

After introducing a new coordinate q as $x = \cosh(q)$ (we consider the right hand side of the barrier and $0 \leq q < \infty$) the hamiltonian (8) takes the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int dq \left(\Pi^2 + (\partial_q \Psi)^2 + \frac{g_s \sqrt{\pi}}{\sinh^2(q)} (\Pi^2 \partial_q \Psi + \frac{1}{3} (\partial_q \Psi)^3) \right) . \quad (14)$$

The equations of motion for Ψ and Π are ($[\Psi(q, t), \Pi(q', t)] = i\delta(q - q')$)

$$\partial_t \Pi = \partial_q^2 \Psi + \frac{g}{2} \partial_q \frac{\Pi^2 + (\partial_q \Psi)^2}{\sinh^2(q)} , \quad \partial_t \Psi = \Pi \left(1 + \frac{g}{\sinh^2(q)} \partial_q \Psi \right) , \quad (15)$$

where $g \equiv g_s \sqrt{\pi}$. Eliminating Π from these equations one easily obtains

$$\frac{1}{A(\Psi)} \partial_t^2 \Psi - A(\Psi) \partial_q^2 \Psi = F(\Psi) ,$$

$$F(\Psi) \equiv \frac{2g(q)}{A(\Psi)^2} \partial_t \Psi \partial_q \partial_t \Psi - \frac{g(q)}{A(\Psi)^3} (\partial_t \Psi)^2 \partial_q (g(q) \partial_q \Psi) - \frac{g(q)}{\tanh(q)} \left(\frac{1}{A(\Psi)^2} (\partial_t \Psi)^2 + (\partial_q \Psi)^2 \right) ,$$
(16)

where

$$A(\Psi) \equiv 1 + g(q) \partial_q \Psi , \quad g(q) \equiv \frac{g}{\sinh^2(q)} .$$
(17)

Here we do not assume that Ψ is small and thus we shall keep all higher powers in Ψ in equation (16).

For large q the equation simplifies to

$$(\partial_t^2 - \partial_q^2) \Psi \sim 0 ,$$
(18)

with solution $\Psi = \Psi_+(t+q) + \Psi_-(t-q)$.

Along similar lines as in the first part of this note, now we assume a physical situation in which there is an incoming wave Ψ_0 and study the dynamics of small fluctuations,

$$\Psi = \Psi_0 + \varepsilon , \quad \varepsilon \ll \Psi_0 .$$
(19)

We shall be interested only in large distance physics, where one expects to find analogous results as those coming from the α' expansion of the $D = 2$ continuum string theory.

Inserting the expansion (19) in (16) and retaining only the linear terms in ε we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{A(\Psi_0)} \partial_t^2 \varepsilon - A(\Psi_0) \left(1 - \left(\frac{g(q) \partial_t \Psi_0}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \right)^2 \right) \partial_q^2 \varepsilon - \frac{2g(q)}{A(\Psi_0)^2} \partial_t \Psi_0 \partial_q \partial_t \varepsilon + Q \partial_q \varepsilon + T \partial_t \varepsilon \\ & = A(\Psi_0) \partial_q^2 \Psi_0 - A^{-1}(\Psi_0) \partial_t^2 \Psi_0 + F(\Psi_0) , \end{aligned}$$
(20)

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q & \equiv -\partial_q (g(q) \partial_q \Psi_0) - \frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_t^2 \Psi_0 + \partial_q \left(\frac{g^2(q)}{A^3(\Psi_0)} \right) (\partial_t \Psi_0)^2 + \frac{4g^2(q)}{A^3(\Psi_0)} \partial_t \Psi_0 \partial_q \partial_t \Psi_0 , \\ T & \equiv -\partial_q \left(\frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \right) \partial_t \Psi_0 - \frac{2g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_q \partial_t \Psi_0 . \end{aligned}$$

It is remarkable that the $\partial_q \varepsilon$ and $\partial_t \varepsilon$ terms in eq. (20) are such that this

equation can be written in the form

$$G_{\text{eff}}^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \varepsilon = J_{\text{eff}} + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad , \quad (21)$$

where

$$G_{\text{eff}}^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} A^{-1}(\Psi_0) & -\frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_t \Psi_0 \\ -\frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_t \Psi_0 & -A(\Psi_0) \left(1 - \left(\frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_t \Psi_0\right)^2\right) \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (22)$$

$$J_{\text{eff}} = A(\Psi_0) \partial_q^2 \Psi_0 - A^{-1}(\Psi_0) \partial_t^2 \Psi_0 + F(\Psi_0) \quad . \quad (23)$$

An effective, large-distance geometry has emerged. The geometrical interpretation may break down in the vicinity of the wall ($q = 0$) where the $O(\varepsilon^2)$ terms can no longer be ignored. A curious fact is that in these coordinates we have $\det G_{\text{eff}} = -1$ automatically. From eq. (22) we get

$$ds^2 = A(\Psi_0) \left(1 - \left(\frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_t \Psi_0\right)^2\right) dt^2 - A^{-1}(\Psi_0) dq^2 - 2 \frac{g(q)}{A^2(\Psi_0)} \partial_t \Psi_0 dq dt \quad . \quad (24)$$

Eqs. (20) or (21) can be interpreted as the propagation of the scalar field ε in a nontrivial geometry. The source term J_{eff} in the right hand side of eqs. (20), (21) vanishes asymptotically because we demand Ψ_0 to satisfy the free field equation (18).

Now we would like to show explicitly that for a large class of incoming waves this geometry corresponds to a black hole. The simplest case is that in which Ψ_0 is a static solution. This case is no less unphysical than the $D = 2$ *static* black hole solution, but it illustrates some points. From $\partial_q^2 \Psi_0 = 0$ it follows $\partial_q \Psi_0 = \text{const.}$ This can also be obtained from the exact solution

$$\frac{g_s}{\sqrt{\pi}} \partial_x \Psi = \partial_x \zeta_M - \partial_x \zeta_0 \equiv \frac{1}{\pi} [(x^2 - 2M - 1)^{1/2} - (x^2 - 1)^{1/2}] \cong -\frac{M}{\pi|x|} \quad , \quad (25)$$

or $\partial_q \Psi \cong -\frac{M}{g}$. Thus we choose

$$\partial_q \Psi_0 \equiv -\frac{M}{g} \quad . \quad (26)$$

Inserting eq. (26) into eqs. (20), (24) we obtain

$$(A_0^{-1}\partial_t^2 - A_0\partial_q^2)\varepsilon = J_0 + O(\varepsilon^2) , \quad J_0 = O(M^2 e^{-2q}) , \quad (27)$$

$$ds^2 = A_0 dt^2 - A_0^{-1} dq^2 , \quad A_0 \equiv 1 - M \frac{1}{\sinh^2(q)} \sim 1 - 4M e^{-2q} . \quad (28)$$

This has the same form as the expression for the Witten black hole. More exactly, after a change of coordinates $\cosh(q) = \sqrt{1+M} \cosh(r)$ we obtain

$$ds^2 = -dr^2 + \beta^2(r) dt^2 , \quad \beta^2(r) = (M+1)(M \coth^2(r) + 1)^{-1} , \quad (29)$$

which is the ‘exact’ metric found in ref. [16] (an exact solution to the tree-level sigma-model β -function equations, see also ref. [24]).^{*}

In ref. [14] the parameter M was identified with the ADM mass, which is usually assumed to be positive. This geometry has a horizon at $\sinh^2(q_H) = M$ and a singularity at $q = 0$ or $x = 1$, i.e. the position of the Polchinski wall (of course, the present ‘linear’ approximation breaks down much before getting to the wall, so the singularity may just be an illusion for distant observers).

Considering this particular form for Ψ_0 is equivalent to the expansion $\zeta = \zeta_M + \frac{q_s}{\pi}\varepsilon$ (see eqs.(13), (19)). If we now introduce a coordinate q_M as $x = \sqrt{1+2M} \cosh(q_M)$ then we would obtain eq.(16) with ε instead of Ψ , i.e. an equation of the form $(\partial_{q_M}^2 - \partial_t^2)\varepsilon = O(\varepsilon^2)$. This of course agrees with eq.(27) after changing $q \rightarrow q_M$, which takes the metric $G_{\mu\nu}^{\text{eff}}$ to the conformal gauge. In this gauge the black hole geometry is not manifest, but the coordinate q_M is not geodesically complete since it does not cover the region $\sqrt{1+2M} > x > 1$. In particular it does not include the horizon at $x = \sqrt{M+1}$.

As a second example we consider a high pulse $\Psi_0 = \Psi_+(x+t)$ coming from $x = \infty$ which extends above the line $p = |x|$. The eigenvalues above the line will be on trajectories which carry them over the barrier to $x < 0$. For a very high pulse the reflected part can be ignored. Consider for example the case in which Ψ_+ is of the form, $\partial_q \Psi_+(x+t) = -E e^{-(x+t)^2}$, $E < 0$. Then $A_0(\Psi_0) = 1 - \frac{gE}{x^2-1} e^{-(x+t)^2}$. This geometry has naked singularities at $x = \pm 1$. The pulse may be interpreted as a wormhole connecting the two asymptotically flat sides of the barrier.

^{*} The fact that the exact DVV metric appeared should actually be regarded as a fortunate ‘improvement’ of the present approximation. For example, a change of $\partial_q \Psi_0$ from the constant value $\partial_q \Psi_0 = -\frac{M}{g}$ to $\partial_q \Psi_0 = -\frac{M}{g} + O(e^{-2q})$ would modify the metric by $O(e^{-4q})$. A generic feature of all these DVV type metrics is the singularity at $q = 0$.

Our third example is a low energy density pulse (by ‘low energy density pulse’ we mean a pulse which does not represent a large deviation from the static solution, where some degenerate behaviours can occur, leading to multivalued functions $p_{\pm}$ [7]). The exact tree-level S -matrix for these pulses in the bosonic formalism was found in [7] (for discussions in the fermionic formulation see e.g. ref. [5]). In the terms proportional to ε we can make use of the Polchinski exact solutions replacing Ψ_0 by Ψ since this does not affect the equation to linear order in ε . Replacing Ψ_0 by Ψ in eqs. (22), (24) and using eqs. (10), (13) we obtain

$$G_{\text{eff}}^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2 \sinh(q)}{p_+ - p_-} & \frac{p_+ + p_-}{p_+ - p_-} \\ \frac{p_+ + p_-}{p_+ - p_-} & \frac{2 p_+ p_-}{(p_+ - p_-) \sinh(q)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (30)$$

or

$$ds^2 = -\frac{2p_+ p_-}{(p_+ - p_-) \sqrt{x^2 - 1}} dt^2 - \frac{2\sqrt{x^2 - 1}}{p_+ - p_-} dq^2 + 2 \frac{p_+ + p_-}{p_+ - p_-} dq dt \quad (31)$$

Far away, $p_{\pm} = \pm x$, the $dq dt$ term vanishes and the metric asymptotically approaches to the Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. Eq. (31) provides a geometrical interpretation of the scattering process for all t , and large x . The metric (31) has a potential singularity at $x^2 = 1$ which may be absent in some specific cases. For example, if at $x \cong 1$ the momenta $p_{\pm}$ take its static values $\sim \pm \sqrt{x^2 - 1}$ then the potential singularity cancels out. But if at some time t a pulse is moving near the wall, $p_{\pm}(x \cong 1, t)$ will take values very different from the static case and the metric can have a singularity at $x = 1$, presumably a curvature singularity (as viewed by a distant observer). Thus the picture is the following: whenever a pulse is sent in, an observer at large $x = x_0$ will see a time-dependent geometry $G_{\text{eff}}^{\mu\nu}(x \cong x_0, t)$ given by eq. (30), which is curved in the regions where the pulse differs from the static solution, and nearly flat elsewhere. When the pulse is close to the wall, a singularity may develop and the observer at x_0 may measure a large-distance black hole geometry.

To be more specific, let us consider the case of a ‘step’ pulse coming from $x = \infty$ and travelling anti-clockwise along the Fermi surface in momentum space. When the pulse passes by, p_+ switches from the static value $\sqrt{x^2 - 1}$ to $\sqrt{x^2 - 2M - 1}$, $M > 0$. After the step pulse has reached the wall, $p_+ = \sqrt{x^2 - 2M - 1}$ for all x . Then p_- starts switching from its static value $-\sqrt{x^2 - 1}$ to $-\sqrt{x^2 - 2M - 1}$ as the step pulse travels from $x = 1$ to $x = \infty$ along the lower branch of the Fermi surface. The time-depending metric $G_{\text{eff}}^{\mu\nu}(x, t)$ is equal to $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ at the points x which have not yet been reached by the pulse. It is

$$ds^2 = A_1 dt^2 - A_1^{-1} dq^2 - \frac{M}{\sinh^2(q)} dq dt, \quad A_1 \equiv 1 - \frac{M}{2} \frac{1}{\sinh^2(q)}, \quad (32)$$

at the x which have been only reached by the ingoing step pulse (we have dropped subleading terms in e^{-2q} , the exact form can be read from eq. (31)), and $ds^2 = \frac{p_+}{\sinh(q)} dt^2 - \frac{\sinh(q)}{p_+} dq^2 \cong A_0 dt^2 - A_0^{-1} dq^2$ at the x which have also been reached by the outgoing step pulse (A_0 has been defined in eq.(28)). This is the metric everywhere for $t \rightarrow \infty$; it has a horizon at $p_+ = 0$, i.e. $x_H^2 = 2M + 1$, and a singularity at $x = 1$.

Now one is led to some speculation. Comparing with $D = 2$ continuum string theory black holes, we see that in this scenario and in the large-distance approximation $-\partial_q \Psi_0$ plays the role of the integral of an energy-momentum tensor (cf. e.g. eq. (6)). If this energy-momentum tensor is positive-definite then this integral is a monotonically nondecreasing quantity, which is the basic reason why classical black holes can only increase in size. One could be tempted to demanding positivity on some of the derivatives of $-\partial_q \Psi_0$ to guarantee that only positive ‘energy density’ is entering into the system. This *ad hoc* restriction of the incoming pulses would always lead -in the classical theory- to metrics of the DVV type (28) as final state. In the case of the step pulse considered above $-\partial_q \Psi_0$ is in fact monotonically nondecreasing, but, in particular, in the case of localized pulses it is not. After a localized pulse is reflected and gets off from the wall, $p_{\pm}$ takes again values near the static solution and any seeming black hole geometry evanesces.

When all higher powers of ε are incorporated the exact scattering amplitude of low-energy pulses is unitary and reveals no singularity or anomalous behaviour. Perhaps this is a clue of a secret reconciliation between black hole physics and quantum mechanics.

Acknowledgements: I wish to thank W. Fischler, L. Susskind and A. Tseytlin for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

1. D. Gross and N. Milkovic, Phys. Lett. 238B (1990) 217; E. Brezin, V. Kazakov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B338 (1990) 673; G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. 238B (1990) 209; P. Ginsparg and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Lett. 240B (1990) 333.
2. S.R. Das and A. Jevicki, Mod. Phys. Lett. A5 (1990) 1639.
3. J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. B346 (1990) 253
4. D. Gross and I. Klebanov, Nucl. Phys. B352 (1990) 671; A.M. Sengupta and S.R. Wadia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 1961.
5. D. Gross and I. Klebanov, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 3.
6. D. Gross, I. Klebanov and M. Newmann, Nucl. Phys. B350 (1991) 621; U. Danielsson and D. Gross, Princeton Preprint PUPT-1258 (1991).
7. J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. B362 (1991) 125.
8. K. Demeterfi, A. Jevicki and J.P. Rodrigues, Nucl. Phys. B362 (1991) 173 and Nucl. Phys. B365 (1991) 199; G. Mandal, A.M. Sengupta and S.R. Wadia, Mod. Phys. Lett. A6 (1991) 1465; G. Moore, Nucl. Phys. B368 (1992) 557; G. Moore, M.R. Plesser and S. Ramgoolam, Nucl. Phys. B377 (1992) 143.
9. J. Avan and A. Jevicki, Phys. Lett B266 (1991) 35; Phys. Lett. B272 (1990) 17; Mod. Phys. Lett. A7 (1992) 357.
10. S.R. Das, A. Dhar, G. Mandal and S.R. Wadia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A7 (1992); Mod. Phys. Lett. A7 (1992) 71; Mod. Phys. Lett. A7 (1992) 937.
11. G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A7 (1992) 2601.
12. T. Eguchi, H. Kanno and S.K. Yang, Newton Institute Preprint NT-92004 (1992).
13. A.A. Tseytlin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A5 (1990) 1833.
14. E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991) 314.
15. G. Mandal, A. Sengupta and S.R. Wadia, Mod. Phys. Lett. A6 (1991) 1685
16. R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B371 (1992) 269.
17. J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B272 (1991) 261; Phys. Lett. B267 (1991) 465; R. Brustein and S. de Alwis, Phys. Lett. B272 (1991) 285.
18. E. Witten, IAS preprint, IASSNS-HEP-92/24.

19. S. R. Das, Tata Institute preprint, TIFR-TH-92/62 (1992); A. Dhar, G. Mandal and S.R. Wadia, Tata Institute preprint, TIFR-TH-92/63 (1992).
20. P. Di Francesco and D. Kutasov, Phys. Lett. B261 (1991) 385.
21. A. Polyakov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A6 (1991) 635.
22. E. Martinec and S. Shatashvili, Nucl. Phys. B368 (1992) 338.
23. E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B373 (1992) 187; I. Klebanov and A. Polyakov, Mod. Phys.Lett. A6 (1991) 3273.
24. A.A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. B268 (1991) 175.